

# FAX COVER SHEET

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 02 2007

**PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS FACSIMILE**

Attention: MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS

Group Art Unit: 2623  
Examiner: Joseph G. Ustaris

Fax: (571) 273-8300

Supervisory Examiner: Andrew I. Faile

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Phone: (571) 272-7383

Alt: (571) 272-7375

Pages: Cover + 1 + 4 = 6

Date: January 2, 2007

From: Georgann S. Grunebach

Fax: (310) 964-0941

Assistant General Counsel

Phone: (310) 964-4615

The information contained in this facsimile is confidential and may also contain privileged attorney-client information or work product. The information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received the facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, and return the original message to us at the address below via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that the correspondence identified above is being facsimile transmitted to (571) 273-8300 (Centralized Facsimile Number), addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on January 2, 2007.

  
Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179  
(Printed Name of Depositor)January 2, 2007  
(Date of Signature)

Re: Serial No. 09/844,932

Attorney Docket No. PD-201027A

Please find attached:

- TRANSMITTAL FORM PTO/SB/21 (1 page)
- REPLY BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2006 (4 pages)

If you do not receive all pages, or pages are not clear, please call Karen Lum at (310) 964-0735.

The DirecTV Group, Inc., CA/LA1/A109, P. O. Box 956, El Segundo, CA 90245

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 02 2007

PTO/SB/21 (09-06)

Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0551-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL  
FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

5

Application Number

09/844,932

Filing Date

April 26, 2001

First Named Inventor

Erin H. Sibley

Art Unit

2823

Examiner Name

USTARIS, Joseph G.

Attorney Docket Number

PD-201027A

## ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Fee Transmittal Form
- ☐ Fee Attached
- ☐ Amendment/Reply
- ☐ After Final
- ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application
- ☐ Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation
- ☐ Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Landscape Table on CD

- ☐ After Allowance Communication to TC
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☒ Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☐ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

Remarks

## SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

The DirectTV Group, Inc.

Signature

Printed name

Georgann S. Grunebach

Date

January 2, 2007

Reg. No.

33,179

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Georgann S. Grunebach

Date

January 2, 2007

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

JAN 02 2007

01/02/2007 17:39 FAX 3109640941

P &amp; L LEGAL

003/006

## CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to (571)-273-8300 (Centralized Facsimile Number), addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 2, 2007.

(date of facsimile transmission)

Georgann S. Grunebach (Name of Registered Representative)

Reg. No. 37,179

Customer Number 020991

(Signature)

January 2, 2007 (Date of Signature)

*Patent*  
**PD-201027A**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In Re Application of

Erin H. Sibley

Art Unit: 2623

Serial No. 09/844,932

Examiner: Ustaris, Joseph G.

Filed: April 26, 2001

For: PORTABLE DEVICE FOR USE WITH DIGITAL OVER-THE-AIR  
COMMUNICATION SYSTEM FOR USE WITH TERRESTRIAL  
BROADCASTING SYSTEM

**REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 29, 2006, please enter the following remarks.

U.S.S.N. 09/844,932

2

PD-201027A

**REMARKS**

Appellants acknowledge that the Examiner has withdrawn the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, on page 2 of the Examiner's Answer.

In the Response to Argument section beginning on page 12, the Examiner argues with respect to claims 7-12 and 15 that the Shintani reference discloses excess bandwidth for carrying a digital video stream. The Examiner specifically points to column 1, lines 18-29. The Examiner specifically states on page 12 that:

"Shintani discloses a digital broadcast system that is implemented over a conventional analog broadcast system. A single physical channel represents one 6 MHz channel, where in the analog case, one analog signal is carried in the 6 MHz channel. However, in the digital case, that one 6 MHz physical channel has 'excess bandwidth' to carry more than one digital streamer for two channels. Shintani discloses that the single physical channel can include multiple virtual channels."

The Appellants have reviewed column 1, lines 18-29 and admit that a frequency band is disclosed that can carry a signal which is an encoded digital transport stream. In fact, this passage describes several physical channels or "virtual channels." However, no teaching or suggestion is provided in these passages for excess bandwidth. More specifically, no teaching or suggestion is found for virtual channels being provided in the excess bandwidth of an over-the-air digital broadcast television signals. Appellants, therefore, respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claims 7-12 and 15.

In the last paragraph of page 12, the Examiner argues that Kim discloses the limitations recited in claims 1-6, 13 and 14 with respect to the vertical blanking interval grabber. It should be noted that claim 1 specifically recites in the preamble a portable appliance for receiving a digital video stream embedded in a vertical blanking interval with broadcast television signal. Claim 1 further recites "a vertical blanking interval frame grabber for receiving the digital video stream." Appellants admit that the Kim reference discloses that an HTML signal is transmitted in the vertical blanking interval. In column 5, lines 5-15, of the Kim reference states that the decoder receives the text code from the TV decoder. More specifically, the HTML signal is "text code" and is, therefore, not video. Appellants have recognized that by compressing a digital video stream, the digital video stream may be inserted within the vertical blanking interval of a broadcast television signal. Appellants, therefore, do not agree that Kim teaches a vertical blanking interval frame grabber for receiving a digital video stream.

U.S.S.N. 09/844,932

3

PD-201027A

In the second full paragraph of page 13 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner states:

"Freeman discloses a system that is capable to compress/decompress signals in a video communication system in order to reduce the data transfer requirements thereby using the available bandwidth more efficiently."

Applicants admit that the Freeman reference does teach compressing a video signal to reduce the data transfer requirements as stated by the Examiner. However, there is no teaching in Freeman for decompressing a digital video stream into a decompressed video stream that is decompressed from a vertical blanking interval. Appellants, therefore, respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to claims 1-6, 13 and 14.

In the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14, the Examiner disagrees with the Appellants regarding the Cho reference. More specifically, the Appellants argue that Cho does not disclose a cradle disposed within an automotive vehicle. Claim 3 specifically recites that the cradle that is coupled to a first antenna and receives a portable user appliance from claim 2 is disposed within an automotive vehicle. Appellants admit that the Cho reference illustrates an automotive vehicle in Figure 1. It should be noted in Figure 2 that the apparatus body may be considered a cradle for a portable television. The Examiner points to column 4, line 53 through column 5, line 18 for teaching "the portable television 20 is connected to an automobile, where the apparatus body 10 is replaced with an apparatus body that will allow the portable television to connect to the automobile." Appellants respectfully disagree. Appellants have reviewed these sections. In the sentence bridging columns 4 and 5, the Cho reference states:

"During outings, while on vacation, etc., the portable television receiver 20 is separated from the body 10, and then connected to an automobile. Accordingly, the television broadcast can be received."

In this case, the portable television receiver 20 can also be used as the above-mentioned rear monitor. Thus, Appellants believe it is clear that using the cradle within an automotive vehicle is not contemplated. Specifically, the Cho reference teaches that the body or cradle 10 is separated from the body and then the portable television receiver may be connected to the automobile. Appellants believe it is clear that the cradle is not used within the automobile. Merely the portable television receiver is used within the automobile or connected to the automobile.

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner states that the Cho reference discloses that the unit is connected to the automobile thereby making the unit part of the automobile. While

U.S.S.N. 09/844,932

4

PD-201027A

column 5, lines 1-8 disclose "connected to an automobile" there is no teaching or suggestion for receiving over-the-air analog broadcast signals with an automobile antenna. Figure 2 is the figure that specifically illustrates the automobile. There is no teaching or suggestion with respect to Figure 1 for an automobile antenna. The portable television receiver in the Cho reference has its own antenna. Appellants merely believe that coupling to an automotive vehicle means physically coupling the portable television receiver to the automotive vehicle when within the vehicle. Appellants can only speculate that this is for the convenience of viewing television signals on the device.

Appellants, therefore, respectfully request the Board to reverse the Examiner's position with respect to each and every claim of the present application in view of the above remarks and the Appeal Brief. Appellants thank the Board for their consideration. Should the Board have any questions regarding this matter, the Board is directed to contact the undersigned directly.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this appeal to Deposit Account 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 2, 2007

By: 

Georgann S. Grunebach, Reg. No. 33,179  
Attorney for Appellants

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
CA/LA1/A109  
2230 East Imperial Highway  
P.O. Box 956  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Telephone: (310) 964-4615